

Appl. No. 10/708,242
Amdt. dated January 23, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 05, 2007

REMARKS

Advisory Action mailed 01/05/2007 – Claims allowed: all pending

5 “... dependent claims must be in a sequential order from their respective parent claims according to Rule 1.47. Normally, the assigned examiner does that at the time of allowance. However, there are so many new and old dependent claims in various combinations (claim number goes as high as 168), it is almost impossible and requires a considerable amount of time for the examiner to renumber all the claims in a sequential order as required by Rule 1.47. Applicant is requested to renumber the claims in a
10 sequential order as required by R1.47 so that the examiner does not have to renumber the claims at the time of the allowance.”

Firstly, applicant assumes the Examiner made a typo in quoting Rule 1.47 because 37 CFR 1.47 is entitled, “Filing when an inventor refuses to sign or cannot be reached.” Applicant assumes the Examiner meant to quote 37 CFR 1.75 entitled, “Claim(s).” 37 CFR
15 1.75 is further described in MPEP section 608.01(n) entitled, “Dependent Claims”, which the applicant has carefully followed when making the below described amendments to the claims.

Secondly, the Examiner requested that the applicant renumber the claims in a sequential order “so that the examiner does not have to renumber the claims at the time of the
20 allowance”. However, in order to properly follow the revised claim amendment practices described in 37 CFR 1.121, applicant is unable to renumber the claims starting at claim 1 as will be required at the time of the allowance. For example, there were already several claim numbers that were canceled and 37 CFR 1.121 states, “A claim which was previously canceled may be reinstated only by adding the claim as a ‘new’ claim with a new claim
25 number.” The new claims listed above are ordered in sequential order so that all dependent claims depend upon an earlier claim. Applicant assumes that the Examiner will still be able to shift the claims numbers at the time of allowance so that the first claim begins at claim number 1. Although there are many claims, this operation should not require excessive time

Appl. No. 10/708,242
Amdt. dated January 23, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 05, 2007

of the Examiner because it simply involves subtracting 168 from each of the claim numbers in the above claim listing.

With the above assumptions in mind, the applicant has canceled all previously pending claims from 1 to 168 and has added corresponding new claims 169-297 being ordered in a sequential order as requested by the Examiner. There are now no claims that depend upon a later claim, and the above claim listing is thereby in compliance with 37 CFR 1.75. In particular, 37 CFR 1.75(c) states, "One or more claims may be presented in dependent form, referring back to and further limiting another claim or claims in the same application." No changes to the claims other than putting them in a sequential order and changing the claim numbers to match is made. No new matter is added.

For the record, the following table shows the exact one to one correspondence of each of the above new claims to its old claim number in the previous amendments to the claims filed by applicant on 12/04/2006. Only the presented order of the claims and the corresponding claim numbers is changed. No new claim limitations are added, and the claimed subject matter of the invention is not changed in any way whatsoever. The claims are now simply ordered in a sequential order as requested by the Examiner where each dependent claim only refers to earlier claim(s) as required by 37 CFR 1.75(c).

| Old Claim # | New Claim # |
|-------------|-------------|
| 1 | 169 |
| 2 | 170 |
| 5 | 171 |
| 6 | 172 |
| 11 | 173 |
| 140 | 174 |
| 12 | 175 |
| 141 | 176 |
| 13 | 177 |

Appl. No. 10/708,242
Amdt. dated January 23, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 05, 2007

| | |
|-----|-----|
| 14 | 178 |
| 15 | 179 |
| 16 | 180 |
| 17 | 181 |
| 18 | 182 |
| 19 | 183 |
| 142 | 184 |
| 20 | 185 |
| 143 | 186 |
| 21 | 187 |
| 22 | 188 |
| 23 | 189 |
| 24 | 190 |
| 25 | 191 |
| 26 | 192 |
| 27 | 193 |
| 28 | 194 |
| 29 | 195 |
| 30 | 196 |
| 31 | 197 |
| 32 | 198 |
| 33 | 199 |
| 34 | 200 |
| 35 | 201 |
| 36 | 202 |
| 144 | 203 |
| 37 | 204 |

Appl. No. 10/708,242
Amdt. dated January 23, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 05, 2007

| | |
|-----|-----|
| 38 | 205 |
| 39 | 206 |
| 40 | 207 |
| 41 | 208 |
| 42 | 209 |
| 43 | 210 |
| 44 | 211 |
| 45 | 212 |
| 145 | 213 |
| 46 | 214 |
| 146 | 215 |
| 47 | 216 |
| 147 | 217 |
| 48 | 218 |
| 49 | 219 |
| 50 | 220 |
| 51 | 221 |
| 52 | 222 |
| 53 | 223 |
| 54 | 224 |
| 55 | 225 |
| 56 | 226 |
| 57 | 227 |
| 58 | 228 |
| 59 | 229 |
| 60 | 230 |
| 61 | 231 |

Appl. No. 10/708,242
Amdt. dated January 23, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 05, 2007

| | |
|-----|-----|
| 62 | 232 |
| 63 | 233 |
| 64 | 234 |
| 65 | 235 |
| 66 | 236 |
| 67 | 237 |
| 68 | 238 |
| 69 | 239 |
| 70 | 240 |
| 71 | 241 |
| 72 | 242 |
| 73 | 243 |
| 74 | 244 |
| 148 | 245 |
| 75 | 246 |
| 149 | 247 |
| 76 | 248 |
| 150 | 249 |
| 77 | 250 |
| 151 | 251 |
| 79 | 252 |
| 80 | 253 |
| 82 | 254 |
| 152 | 255 |
| 83 | 256 |
| 153 | 257 |
| 84 | 258 |

Appl. No. 10/708,242
Amdt. dated January 23, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 05, 2007

| | |
|-----|-----|
| 154 | 259 |
| 85 | 260 |
| 155 | 261 |
| 86 | 262 |
| 156 | 263 |
| 87 | 264 |
| 88 | 265 |
| 89 | 266 |
| 157 | 267 |
| 90 | 268 |
| 158 | 269 |
| 91 | 270 |
| 92 | 271 |
| 93 | 272 |
| 94 | 273 |
| 95 | 274 |
| 96 | 275 |
| 97 | 276 |
| 98 | 277 |
| 99 | 278 |
| 159 | 279 |
| 100 | 280 |
| 160 | 281 |
| 101 | 282 |
| 161 | 283 |
| 102 | 284 |
| 162 | 285 |

Appl. No. 10/708,242
Amdt. dated January 23, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 05, 2007


| | |
|-----|-----|
| 103 | 286 |
| 163 | 287 |
| 104 | 288 |
| 164 | 289 |
| 105 | 290 |
| 165 | 291 |
| 106 | 292 |
| 166 | 293 |
| 107 | 294 |
| 167 | 295 |
| 108 | 296 |
| 168 | 297 |

As all claims have been previously found allowable by the Examiner, and as the above claim listing now complies with 37 CFR 1.75, applicant again respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

5

Appl. No. 10/708,242
Amdt. dated January 23, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 05, 2007

Sincerely yours,



Date: 01/23/2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)